

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Rosa L. Pringle,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	C.A. No. 2:04-22967-23
vs.	)	<b><u>ORDER</u></b>
	)	
Charleston County School District,	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

This matter is before the court upon the United States Magistrate Judge’s recommendation that Plaintiff Rosa L. Pringle’s Title VII action be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. The record contains a report and recommendation of the Magistrate (“the R&R”), which was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). A party may object, in writing, to a R&R within ten days after being served with a copy of that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1). Plaintiff has filed timely objections to the R&R.

This court is charged with conducting a *de novo* review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s R&R to which a specific objection is registered and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that R&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1). Having reviewed the entire record, including Plaintiff’s objections, the court concludes that the R&R accurately summarizes the facts and law applicable to this matter, and correctly recommends the summary dismissal of Plaintiff’s claims for the simple reason that Plaintiff has wholeheartedly failed to comply with Title VII’s filing requirements. *See, e.g.*, R&R at 2-5; *see also* 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-16(c) (2000); *Bryant v. Bell Atlantic Maryland, Inc.*, 288 F.3d 124, 132 (4th Cir.2002); *Sloop v. Memorial Mission Hosp., Inc.*, 198 F.3d 147, 148 (4th Cir. 1999). In her objections, Plaintiff fails to offer any evidence that she has complied with Title VII’s filing requirements in contravention of the Magistrate’s conclusion. Instead, Plaintiff only raises other non-meritorious arguments, such as that

an attorney friend told her that she could file in state or federal court, and that “[i]t is not anyone[’s] business, who, or what court, state or federal” in which she raises her claims. (Obj. at 3). Because, as the Magistrate reasoned, Plaintiff has wholly failed to comply with Title VII’s filing requirements, her complaint is appropriate for summary dismissal.<sup>1</sup>

It is therefore **ORDERED**, for the foregoing reasons, that Plaintiff’s complaint is hereby **DISMISSED** without prejudice and without service and issuance of process.

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Patrick Michael Duffy  
**PATRICK MICHAEL DUFFY**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

**Charleston, South Carolina**  
**May 10, 2005**

---

<sup>1</sup>To the extent that Plaintiff also seeks to raise a false arrest claim for an unspecified event that occurred in the late 1990s, the court similarly finds this claim without merit. First, and most significantly, Plaintiff has offered no facts whatsoever in support of this claim. Additionally, the court is unconvinced that the named Defendant, the Charleston County School District, is the entity responsible for any claim Plaintiff may have. Finally, Plaintiff has raised no arguments with respect to this claim in her Objections to the R&R.